



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,589

10/17/2003

Sasson Somekh

004393

7414

7590

05/06/2005

USA/02/MTCG/PCTRL/

EXAMINER

MASINICK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2125

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Applied Materials, Inc.
Patent Counsel, MS/2061
Legal Affairs Dept.
P.O. Box 450A
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,589

Applicant(s)

SOMEKH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Masinick

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 36-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 36-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/7/04, 12/8/04, 8/11/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment and arguments dated 12/22/2004 have been reviewed and are not found to be persuasive. Applicant has added the phrase "using the information stored in the wafer status file to modify said wafer" and asserts that this claim element is not shown in Friedman, thus making the claims allowable over the prior art.

Examiner disagrees with this assessment and points specifically to column 2, lines 31-43 of Friedman which state that inspection results, among other things, are stored on the memory device. Column 2, lines 48-50 note that the reader [at each production station] can also read the data in the memory and transmit it to a central data processor together with its own data to allow control and evaluation of the manufacturing process. And finally, Column 3, line 67 through Column 4, line 34 show the specific steps through which this information is provided. It is clearly noted in column 4 that the information stored in the memory is used to "measure, control, and improve the performance of" the future steps in the process.

Examiner feels that these features as pointed out clearly read on the claims as amended and this action is therefor made final.

Specification SECOND NOTICE

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not fully describe the invention and includes the purported merits of the invention. The abstract should be a 50-150 word narrative summary of the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 2125

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities; Page 2, line 9 - The "station controllers" indicated in the specification as "112-116" should actually be "106-110" per the drawing figure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 8 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Friedman (USPN 6,078,845 A).

Referring to claims 8 and 36, Friedman shows a method for associating information with a wafer in a semiconductor processing facility (column 1, lines 5-10), comprising the steps of: (1) processing a wafer at a first wafer processing tool, and storing first information pertaining to said wafer on a traveling information file, wherein said traveling information file comprises information pertaining to the status of said wafer (column 5, lines 21-27), (2) transferring said wafer to a second wafer processing tool (Figure 1 and column 3, lines 34-51); (3) transferring said traveling information file with said wafer to said second wafer processing tool; (4) receipt of said traveling information file by said second wafer processing tool (steps 3 and 4 are read at column 6, lines 35-61); and (5) processing said wafer at said second processing tool using said first information in said wafer status file to modify said wafer, and storing second information

Art Unit: 2125

pertaining to said wafer on said traveling information file (column 5, lines 4-20). Claim 36 has the same functional limitations as claim 8, and therefore is anticipated by the same citations in the combined references. Claims 8 and 36 are read in entirety in Friedman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedman (USPN 6,078,845 A) in view of Stoddard et al. (USPN 6,587,744 B1).

4. Claims 37 and 38 have the same basic functional limitations as claim 8 with additional feedback and recipe requirements that are not specifically recited in Friedman.

5. Stoddard et al., analogous to Friedman in that both system concern semiconductor processing control (Stoddard et al., column 1, lines 15-18), reads on the additional requirements of Claim 37 and 38 as follows: (7) processing a second wafer at said first wafer processing tool using said at least some of said second information of said step (6) (column 2, lines 17-41).

6. Referring to claim 38, Stoddard shows wherein wafer information entity contains a recipe or a modification of said recipe, and wherein said first wafer processing tool comprises the step of using said recipe or said modification of said recipe in said wafer information entity to process said wafer (column 4, lines 50-59).

Art Unit: 2125

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the features of Stoddard et al. into the Friedman system have provided a system that could automatically make intelligent decisions as to what variables to change in the recipe to maintain the desired process target (Stoddard et al., column 4, lines 50-59).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Masinick whose telephone number is (571) 272-3746. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30-4:00.

Art Unit: 2125

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MDM

Jayprakash N. Gandhi
Primary Examiner 2100
Technology Center 2800

